

EXHIBIT 4

Filed Under Seal

1 Clement S. Roberts (SBN 209203)
2 *croberts@orrick.com*
3 ORRICK HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
4 405 Howard Street
5 San Francisco, CA 94105
6 Tel: (415) 773-5700 -- Fax: (415) 773-5759

7 Alyssa Caridis (SBN 260103)
8 *acaridis@orrick.com*
9 ORRICK HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
10 777 South Figueroa Street, Suite 3200
11 Los Angeles, CA 90017
12 Tel: (213) 629-2020 -- Fax: (213) 612-2499

13 George I. Lee
14 *lee@ls3ip.com*
15 Sean M. Sullivan
16 *sullivan@ls3ip.com*
17 Rory P. Shea
18 *shea@ls3ip.com*
19 J. Dan Smith
20 *smith@ls3ip.com*
21 Michael P. Boyea
22 *boyea@ls3ip.com*
23 Cole B. Richter
24 *richter@ls3ip.com*
25 LEE SULLIVAN SHEA & SMITH LLP
26 656 W Randolph St, Floor 5W
27 Chicago, IL 60661
28 Tel: (312) 754-0002 -- Fax: (312) 754-0003

Attorneys for Sonos, Inc.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

GOOGLE LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

SONOS, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:20-cv-6754

**SONOS, INC.'S CORRECTED
SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES AND
OBJECTIONS TO GOOGLE'S FIRST
SET OF INTERROGATORIES [1-20]**

Judge: Hon. William Alsup
Complaint Filed: September 28, 2020

INTERROGATORY NO. 16

Identify the particular portions, source code, or functionality of all accused applications for Android and iOS devices which Sonos contends meets, in whole or in part, one or more limitations of the Asserted Claims.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 16

Sonos objects to this interrogatory as overbroad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably proportional to the needs of the case insofar as it purports to require Sonos to “[i]dentify . . . *all* accused applications for Android and iOS devices”

Sonos also objects that the interrogatory is vague and ambiguous, particularly with respect to what is meant by “particular portions” of “all accused applications.”

Sonos further objects that the term “Asserted Claims” have not been defined in the interrogatories. Sonos will interpret “Asserted Claims” to mean the asserted claims of the Asserted Patents in this litigation.

Sonos further objects to this Interrogatory as premature to the extent it seeks expert discovery in advance of the date set forth in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and/or the Court’s Scheduling Order.

Sonos further objects to this Interrogatory on the ground that it is a premature contention interrogatory that has been filed before a substantial amount of discovery has been conducted in this lawsuit. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(a)(2) (“[T]he court may order that [a contention] interrogatory need not be answered until after designated discovery is complete”).

Sonos further objects to this Interrogatory as premature to the extent that some of the information called for by this interrogatory is in the possession of Google or third parties and has not yet been produced in this case.

Subject to, and without waiving, the foregoing Specific and General Objections, Sonos states that much of the information necessary to respond to this Interrogatory is uniquely within the possession of Google or third parties, and Sonos will seasonably supplement its response to this Interrogatory upon obtaining such information, including at least information produced in

1 response to subpoenas served on Spotify, as well as Google’s responses to Interrogatory Nos. 13,
2 14, 15, and 16, which are incorporated by reference herein.

3 Sonos also incorporates by reference herein its preliminary infringement contentions and
4 its final infringement contentions, when served.

5 Sonos reserves the right to revise, correct, add to, supplement, or clarify its response to
6 this Interrogatory as additional information is discovered and/or becomes available.

7
8 **INTERROGATORY NO. 17**

9 *Identify any investigations and/or evaluations regarding the validity, patentability,*
10 *enforceability, scope, and/or infringement of any claim of the Asserted Patents requested or*
11 *conducted by, on behalf of, or known to you, including the dates such activities took place, the*
12 *persons or entities involved in such activities, the nature of such activities, (including any*
13 *analysis or investigation of the Accused Products for purposes of infringement and the identity of*
14 *those products), whether any decision was made or action taken by or on your behalf in whole or*
15 *in part as a result of such activities and identify all documents concerning the subject matter of*
16 *this Interrogatory.*

17
18 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 17**

19 Sonos objects to this interrogatory as overbroad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably
20 proportional to the needs of the case insofar as it purports to require Sonos to “[i]dentify *any*
21 investigations and/or evaluations . . . including *any* analysis or investigation of the Accused
22 Products . . . and identify *all* documents concerning the subject matter of this Interrogatory.”

23 Sonos further objects that this interrogatory is vague and ambiguous, particularly with
24 what is meant by “subject matter of this Interrogatory.”

25 Sonos also objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks information protected by the
26 attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrines.

27 Sonos further objects to this Interrogatory as premature to the extent it seeks expert
28 discovery in advance of the date set forth in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and/or the

1 concerning Sonos's knowledge or awareness . . . and identify *all* Persons with knowledge of
 2 those facts and *all* documents concerning those facts."

3 Sonos also objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks information protected by the
 4 attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrines.

5 Subject to, and without waiving, the foregoing Specific and General Objections, Sonos
 6 states that it became aware of the products accused of infringement in this litigation at or around
 7 the time those products were publicly announced by Google. Sonos's in-house counsel Mark
 8 Triplett (VP, Intellectual Property) and Chris Butts (Senior Director, U.S. Patent Development)
 9 are knowledgeable about Sonos's first awareness of the products accused of infringement in this
 10 case.

11 Additionally, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 33(d), Sonos will produce documents from
 12 which further information sought in this Interrogatory may be derived.

13 Sonos reserves the right to revise, correct, add to, supplement, or clarify its response to
 14 this Interrogatory as additional information is discovered and/or becomes available.

15
 16
 17
 18
 19 Dated: November 30, 2022

ORRICK HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
and
 LEE SULLIVAN SHEA & SMITH LLP

21 By: /s/ Cole B. Richter

22 Cole B. Richter (admitted *pro hac*)

23 *Attorneys for Sonos, Inc.*
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28